

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to claims 1 and 4:

Claim 1 is objected to because it recites, “each bonding pad is connected to one of the first package substrate and the second package substrate,” which is seemingly incorrect.

5

Claim 4 is objected to for reciting “wherein each lead is connected to one pin of the chip-packaging”, because the “lead” and the “pin” are apparently the same thing.

10

Response:

Claim 1 specifies that “each bonding option pad of the chip is associated with at least two bonding options respectively provided by the first package substrate and the second package substrate.” Claim 1 does not recite that the chip-packaging contains leads because the leads are not absolutely necessary for providing each bonding option pad with bonding options. Although the leads would provide each bonding option pad with a third bonding option, the bonding option pads already contain two bonding options that are provided by the first package substrate and the second package substrate. Accordingly, the use of the leads is optional in the present invention.

15

20

Although Niones (US 6,339,252) teaches in column 4, lines 17-24 that the lead 32 is connected to ring 33 and then to conductive pad 64 by separate bonding wires, the present invention does not have exactly the same structure as Niones. The present invention does not require a lead for establishing a connection between a bonding option pad and either the first or the second package substrate. As such, the leads are not critical elements, and the limitation of the leads can be omitted without rendering the invention recited by claim 1 unworkable.

25

Claim 4 has been cancelled, and is no longer in need of consideration.

Acceptance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

5 2. Rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Niones et al. (US 6,339,252, hereinafter Niones) for reasons of record.

Response:

10 Claim 1 recites that “each bonding option pad of the chip is associated with at least two bonding options respectively provided by the first package substrate and the second package substrate, and each bonding option pad is connected to one of the first package substrate and the second package substrate.” Most notably, each bonding option pad can connect to the first package substrate, providing one of the 15 two bonding options.

On the other hand, Niones does not teach that a conductive pad 64 can connect to die pad 31. Although Niones teaches in column 4, lines 17-24 that “ring 33 is connected by a separate bond wire to a conductive pad 64 on integrated circuit device 63”, Niones does not teach each bonding option pad of the chip being associated with at least two bonding options respectively provided by the first package substrate and the second package substrate. Niones teaches in column 4, lines 21-22 that a “die pad 31 is connected to a different lead 32 carrying a ground voltage Vss. However, no connection is taught between the die pad 31 and the 25 conductive pad 64.

For these reasons, Niones fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 20 are dependent on

Appl. No. 10/709,427
Amdt. dated November 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 03, 2006

claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 20 is respectfully requested.

3. Introduction to new claim 21:

5 Claim 21 recites that each bonding option pad is connected to one of the first package substrate and the second package substrate for determining the functionality of the chip. This limitation is supported in paragraph [0027] of the specification, and no new matter is added.

10 In contrast, Niones does not teach the concept of bonding options available to bonding option pads, and does not teach determining the functionality of the chip according to the connection of the bonding option pad to the first or second package substrate. As such, claim 21 should be patentable over Niones.

15 In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/709,427
Amdt. dated November 3, 2006
Reply to Office action of August 03, 2006

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 11/03/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)